



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/463,920	02/01/2000	ARNE EEK	1103326-0603	6956

7470 7590 03/26/2003
WHITE & CASE LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

TRAN, SUSAN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/463,920

Applicant(s)

EEK ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Tran

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27,31,32,35 and 38-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27,31,32,35 and 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's Extension of Time and Amendment filed 01/16/03, Information Disclosure Statement filed 01/21/03.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/21/03 was filed after the mailing date of the Office Action on 07/17/02. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 30 recites the phrase "antisecretory prostaglandin analogue are coating layered with an extended release layer" is confusing. Further clarification is suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1615

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 11-27, 35, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Depui et al. US 6,365,184, in view of Woolfe et al. US 6,387,410.

Depui teaches an oral composition comprising combination of NSAID's and proton pump inhibitor, such as omeprazole, lansoprazole, pantoprazole, or salts thereof; carriers; and excipients (columns 5-8). The composition is useful for the treatment of gastrointestinal disorders (column 1, lines 10-18). The composition can be in the form of pellet, granules, coated pellet, compressed tablet, or capsule (columns 9-14). Depui does not teach combination of proton pump inhibitor and gastric antisecretory prostaglandin.

Woolfe teaches composition comprising combination of NSAID and prostaglandin, such as misoprostol (columns 1-3). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Depui's composition with the use of prostaglandin in view of the teachings of Woolfe, because Woolfe teaches the advantageous result in the use of misoprostol for the treatment of gastrointestinal side-effects associated with NSAID. The expected result would be a single dosage form comprising combination of proton pump inhibitor, NSAID, and prostaglandin for the treatment of gastrointestinal disorders.

Claims 1-4, 11-27, 35, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akira Tari et al. (Digestive Diseases and Sciences, Vol. 42), and Depui et al.

Tari teaches omeprazole-enprostil combination useful for the treatment of peptic ulcer (pages 1744).

Akira is relied upon for the reason stated above. Although Akira teaches the combination of omeprazole-enprostil is orally administered (page 1742), Akira is silent as to the specific oral dosage form.

Depui teaches oral dosage form comprising omeprazole and NSAID in the form of pellet, granules, coated pellet, compressed tablet, or capsule (columns 9-14). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare Akira's composition as an oral dosage form of Depui, because controlled/sustained release oral dosage is useful for the treatment of gastrointestinal disorders.

Claims 5-10, 31, 32, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Depui et al. in view of Woolfe et al., and Shell US 5,582,837.

Depui and Woolfe are relied upon for the reasons stated above. The references are silent as to the teachings of the use of calcium channel blocker.

Shell teaches sustained release dosage form containing calcium channel blockers useful for the treatment of gastric diseases (columns 3-4). Hence, it would have been prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare composition of Depui and Woolfe with calcium channel blocker in view of the teaching of Shell,

because the references teaches the advantageous result of oral formulation useful for treating gastrointestinal disorders. The expected result would be a single dosage form comprising combination of proton pump inhibitor, NSAID, calcium channel blocker, and prostaglandin for the treatment of gastrointestinal disorders.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/16/03 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Nonetheless, the 102(b) rejection by Akira Tari et al. has been withdrawn. The examiner maintains the original 103(a) rejections.

Applicant argues that claim 1 has been amended to include the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" to exclude additional unspecified ingredients, which would affect the basic and novel characteristics of the invention defined in the balance of the claim. Thus, the patentable feature of claim 1 is the combination of an ATP-ase inhibitor and prostaglandin in a single dosage form, and therefore, the combination of Depui and Woolfe; or the combination of Akira Tari and Depui et al., does not suggest the claimed invention since the references disclosed the use of NSAIDs. However, absent a clear indication in the specification of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ at 1355 ("PPG could have defined the scope of the phrase 'consisting essentially of' for purposes of its patent by making clear in its specification what it regarded as constituting a material change in the basic and novel characteristics of the invention."). When an applicant

Art Unit: 1615

contends that additional materials in the prior art are excluded by the recitation of "consisting essentially of," applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional components would materially change the characteristics of applicant's invention. *In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964). Applicant's specification in page 20, lines 14-21, permits the use of calcium channel blocking agent, an NSAID, or other anti-ulcerative agents in combinations with the claimed invention. Thus, it is the position of the examiner that the combination of Depui and Woolfe, or Depui and Akira Tari, does suggest the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument regarding the examiner's conclusion of obviousness, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant argues that the combination of Depui, Woolfe and Shell does not suggest the claimed invention because the amended claim excludes an NSAID. For the above disclosed reasons regarding to the transitional phrase "consisting essentially of", it is the examiner's position that the combination of Depui and Woolfe, and Shell does suggest the claimed invention. In response to applicant's argument regarding the examiner's conclusion of obviousness, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning.

But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Tran whose telephone number is (703) 306-

Art Unit: 1615

5816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3592.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600
TKP